

Application No. 10/021,035

**REMARKS**

In the office action mailed September 20, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Billow et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0141008 A1) "Billow"; rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Billow in view of Meir et al. (U.S. Patent 6,037,950); and rejected claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Billow et al. in view of Murray (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0075505). Claims 1, 7, 8 and 9 were further provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Examiner further objected to the specification citing minor informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses such grounds of rejection. The Examiner objected to claims 4 - 6 as depending from a rejected base claim but indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and include all limitations of the base and intervening claims.

With this response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 - 9; canceled claims 3, 4, and 10; and added claims 11 - 22. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include limitations from allowable claims 3 and 4. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment to claim 1 has removed all grounds of rejection and that claim 1 is now allowable over the art of record. Similarly, claims 2 and 5 – 7 are allowable based on their dependency from claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 8 to include limitations that are similar to those included in claims identified as being allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 8 place the claim in condition for allowance.

Applicants have added two new independent claims 12 and 19. In drafting these claims, Applicants have endeavored to draft claims that include a combination of elements that is not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. In particular both claims 12 and 19 create a transformation query

Application No. 10/021,035

to determine if any assignment records match the query and include a resolution operation to identify a matching record if more than one assignment record matches the query (claim 12) or to identify a record to use as a matching assignment record if none of the assignment record matches the query.

The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Respectfully submitted,



William Eipert  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,664  
Telephone (585) 423-2520

December 20, 2005  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square 20A  
Rochester, New York 14644